UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

STEPHEN GOLASH AND SUSAN GOLASH,

Plaintiffs.

VS.

HOUSEHOLD FINANCE CORPORATION II, PATRICIA A. DAVIS, RICHARD J. VOLPE, And SHECHTMAN HALPERIN SAVAGE, LLP Defendants.

04-12414 GAO

HAMPSHIRE COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT C.A. NO: HSCV2004-00232

USDC C.A. NOECEIPT #_______

SUMMONS ISSUED 1/1/2

WAINER FORM

MCF ISSUED_ BY DPTY_CLK

DATE

NOTICE OF REMOVAL

MAGISTRATE JUDGE

Defendants, Patricia A. Davis, Richard J. Volpe, and Shechtman Halperin Savage, LLP.

hereby submit as follows:

- 1. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1441, 1331, and 1446, the Defendants Patricia A. Davis, Richard J. Volpe, and Shechtman Halperin Savage, LLP (collectively "Defendants") hereby remove to this Court the above-captioned state court civil action which is pending in the Superior Court Department, Hampshire County, Commonwealth of Massachusetts, civil action number HSCV2004-00232.
- 2. On or about October 5, 2004, the plaintiffs Stephen Golash and Susan Golash (collectively "Plaintiffs") filed Civil Action No. HSCV 2004-00232 in Hampshire County Superior Court, against the above listed Defendants. Defendants Patricia A. Davis, Richard J. Volpe, and Shechtman Halperin Savage, LLP were allegedly served on or about October 13, 2004.

Page 2 of 3

- In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 1446(a) and Local Rule 81.1 Defendants 3. have attached hereto true and accurate copies of the Summonses and Complaint served on the Defendants and will, within thirty days of filing this Notice of Removal, caused to be filed with this Court, certified copies of all records and proceedings and docket entries that were originally filed in the state court, if any.
- Defendants have filed no pleadings or papers in the state court action in 4. response to the Complaint.
- This Notice of Removal is being timely filed, within thirty days of the 5. Defendants' receipt of service of the Complaint, in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 1446(b).
- This action is one over which this Court has original jurisdiction under 28 6. U.S.C. § 1441 and §1331 because it is an action arising under the laws of the United States. This action may be removed to this Court pursuant to these provisions because the Plaintiffs' allege Defendants' actions violated the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, 15 U.S.C. §1692 et seq., thereby raising a question of federal law.
- Venue in this Court is proper under 28 U.S.C. §1391(a) because a 7. substantial part of the alleged events giving rise to the Plaintiff's claims allegedly occurred in this District and the parties reside in and/or have a place of business in Massachusetts.
- Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1446(d), the Defendant will provide written notice 8. of this petition to all adverse parties.

9. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1446(d), the Defendant will file a copy of this petition with the Clerk of the Hampshire County Superior Court.

Respectfully submitted, Defendants, Patricia A. Davis, Richard J. Volpe, and Shechtman Halperin Savage, LLP.

By their attorneys,

Joseph S. Berman BBØ No. 566006

Berman & Dowell

210 Commercial Street, 5th Floor

Boston, MA 02109

617-723-9911

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned does hereby certify that the caused a true and accurate copy of the within Notice of Removal (with attachments) was served via overnight delivery, postage prepaid, upon Patricia A. Szumowski, Graham & Albano, P.C., 100 Russell St., P.O. Box 377, Hadley, MA 01035 and Preston Halperin, Esq., Shechtman, Halperin, & Savage, 86 Weybosset Street, Providence, RI 2903on this the 11 day of November 2004.

Joseph S. Berman

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

Catego	ory in which the	
inest	ory in which the case belongs based upon the numbered nature of suit code listed ale 40.1(a)(1))	on the civil cover sheet. (See
iocai rui	ule 40.1(a)(1)).	10 11 12 P
ليسا	 160, 410, 470, R.23, REGARDLESS OF NATURE OF SUIT. 	
	II. 195, 368, 400, 440, 441-444, 540, 550, 555, 625, 710, 720, 730, 740, 790, 791, 820*, 830*, 840*, 850, 890, 892-894, 895, 950.	Also complete AO 120 or AO 121 or patent, trademark or copyright c
	III. 110, 120, 130, 140, 151, 190, 210, 230, 240, 245, 290, 310, 315, 320, 330, 340, 345, 350, 355, 360, 362, 365, 370, 371, 380, 385, 450, 891.	Nated case has been filed in
	IV. 220 422 423 420 400 540 540	C
-	IV. 220, 422, 423, 430, 460, 510, 530, 610, 620, 630, 640, 650, 660, 690, 810, 861-865, 870, 871, 875, 900.	1 0
	V. 150, 152, 153.	
T:41	100, 102, 103.	
this distri	number, if any, of related cases. (See local rule 40.1(g)). If more than one prior educate indicate the title and number of the first filed case in this court.	lated case has been filed in
N/A	and did littliber of the first filed case in this ourt.	assii ingu III
<u></u>	U	
nas a pric	or action between the same parties and based on the same claim ever been filed in	n this court?
	***************************************	M-Warana
28 USC §2	Complaint in this case question the constitutionality of an act of congress affecting 2403)	the public interset? (Soc
·		trie public interest? (See
If so, is the	e U.S.A. or an officer, agent or employee of the U.S. a party?	NO 🗸
	polyse of the U.S. a party?	
	YES	NO 🗸
is this case	e required to be heard and determined by a district court of three judges pursuant	4- 444 - 40 - 40
	, i	
Do all of the	YES	NO L
Massachus	ne parties in this action, excluding governmental agencies of the united states and sets sets ("governmental agencies"), residing in Massachusetts reside in the same di	the Commonwealth of
40.1(d)).	di Massacriusetts reside in the same di	vision? - (See Local Rule
A.	of the non-governmental parties reside?	NO 🗸
	Eastern Division	estern Division
₿,	If no, in which division do the majority of the plaintiffs on the set	
	agencies, residing in Massachusetts reside?	acciding governmental
	Eastern Division Central Division We	stern Division
If filing a Noti	tice of Removal - are there any motions panding the	
yes, submit a	a separate sheet identifying the motions)	ntion of this Court? (If
TYPE OR PR	RINT) YES	NO 🔽
EY'S NAME	Joseph S Power -	home
s		06 Oston, MA 02109
	DED FIOOR D	

SJS 44 (Rev. 3/99)

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS-44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)

Let a the conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet.

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS				DEFENDANTS		
Stephen Golash and Hampshire County Susan Golash (b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)				Household Finance Corporation II, Patrica A. Davis, Richard J. volpe, and Shechtman Halperin Savage, LLP. County of Residence of First Listed (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE LAND INVOLVED.		
(c) Attorney's (Firm Nam Patricia S. Szumov Graham & Albano, Hadley, MA 01035	vski, Esq. # 65383 P.C., 100 Russell	9 St., P.O. Box 3	Attorneys (If Known) Joseph S. Berman, Esq # 566006 Berman and Dowell, 210 Commercial Street, 5th Floor, Boston, MA 02109			
U.S. Government Plaintiff U.S. Government Defendant	Federal Question (U.S. Government) 4 Diversity	in One Box Only) ment Not a Party) enship of Parties	(For D Citizer Citizer	riversity Cases Only) PTF of This State	Incorporated or of Business In Incorporated and Incorporated and	and One Box for Defendant) PTF DEF Principal Place 4 4 This State
IV. NATURE OF SU				EITURE/PENALTY	BANKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES
CONTRACT 110 Insurance 120 Marune 130 Miller Act 140 Negotiable Instrument 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment 151 Medicare Act 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excl. Veterans) 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits 160 Stockholders' Suits 190 Other Contract 195 Contract Product Liability REAL PROPERTY 210 Land Condemnation 220 Foreclosure 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment 240 Torts to Land 245 Tort Product Liability 290 All Other Real Property	PERSONAL INJURY 310 Airplane 315 Airplane Product Liability 320 Assault, Libel & Slander 330 Federal Employers' Liability 340 Marine 345 Marine Product Liability 350 Motor Vehicle 755 Motor Vehicle Product Liability 360 Other Personal Injury CIVIL RIGHTS 441 Voting 442 Employment 443 Housing/ Accommodations 444 Welfare 440 Other Civil Rights	PERSONAL INJU 362 Personal Injury- Med. Malpractic 365 Personal Injury- Product Liability 368 Asbestos Person Injury Product Liability PERSONAL PROPE 370 Other Fraud 371 Truth in Lendin 380 Other Person Property Damag 385 Property Damag Product Liability PRISONER 510 Motions to Vac Sentence Habeas Corpus: 530 General 535 Death Penalty 540 Mandamus & C 550 Civil Rights 555 Prison Condition	RY 61 62 62 62 63 64 65 65 65 65 65 65 65	0 Agriculture 20 Other Food & Drug 25 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 884 30 Liquor Laws 40 R.R. & Truck 50 Airtine Regs. 50 Occupational Safety/Health 90 Other LABOR 10 Fair Labor Standards Act 20 Labor/Mgmt. Relations	422 Appeal 28 USC 158 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157 PROPERTY RIGHTS 820 Copyrights 830 Patent 840 Trademark SOCIAL SECURITY 861 HIA (1395ff) 862 Black Lung (923) 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) 864 SSID Title XVI	□ 400 State Reapportionment □ 410 Antitrust □ 430 Banks and Banking □ 450 Commerce/ICC Rates/etc. □ 460 Deportation □ 470 Racketeer Influenced and □ Corrupt Organizations □ 810 Selective Service □ 850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange □ 875 Customer Challenge □ 12 USC 3410 □ 891 Agricultural Acts □ 892 Economic Stabilization Act □ 893 Environmental Matters □ 894 Energy Allocation Act □ 895 Freedom of □ Information Act □ 900 Appeal of Fee □ Determination □ Under Equal Access to □ Justice □ 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes □ 890 Other Statutory Actions
V. ORIGIN Original R 2 R		X ONLY) Remanded from Appellate Court	Reins 4 Reope	stated or 5 anoth	ferred from er district ify)	
VI. CAUSE OF ACT	Cite the U.S. Civil State Do not cite jurisdiction and 146 and the Fair Deb as Act. N CHECK IF TH UNDER F.R.C SE(S) (See instructions	ute under which you are last statutes unless diversit of Collection Practice. Ils Is a CLASS ACT	filing and writty.) es Act, 15	te brief statement of cause. U.S.C. 1692 et seq.	Plaintiffs have alleged vio	ly if demanded in complaint:
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY	AMOUNT	APPLYING IFP	/	JUDGE _	MAG. JU	DGE

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS DEPARTMENT OF THE TRIAL COURT

HAMPSHIRE, ss.

SUPERIOR COURT DEPARTMENT CIVIL ACTION NO.: 04-232

STEPHEN GOLASH and SUSAN GOLASH,
Plaintiffs,

HOUSEHOLD FINANCE CORPORATION II, PATRICIA A. DAVIS, RICHARD J. VOLPE,

and SHECHTMAN HALPERIN SAVAGE, LLP,
Defendants.

COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES; JURY TRIAL DEMAND

Ü

Plaintiffs STEPHEN GOLASH and SUSAN GOLASH allege as follows: S

BACKGROUND FACTS

- 1. Plaintiff STEPHEN GOLASH is a natural person residing at 100 Schestnut Street, Hatfield, Hampshire County, Massachusetts.
- Plaintiff SUSAN GOLASH is a natural person residing at 100 Chestnut Street,
 Hatfield, Hampshire County, Massachusetts.
- 3. Defendant HOUSEHOLD FINANCE CORPORATION II ("HFC") is a foreign corporation with its principal offices at 2700 Sanders Road, Prospect Heights, Illinois.
- Defendant HFC is licensed to conduct various financial services in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, including mortgage lending services at 935 Riverdale Street, West Springfield, MA.
- 5. Defendant PATRICIA A. DAVIS is a natural person, whose residence is unknown to the Plaintiffs.

RAHAM & ALBANO, P.C. 100 RUSSELL STREET P.O. BOX 377 ADLEY, MA 01035-0377 AREA CODE 413 586-5055 532-3387 FAX: 532-0636

- 6. Defendant RICHARD J. VOLPE is a natural person, whose residence is unknown to the Plaintiffs.
- 7. Defendant SHECHTMAN HALPERIN & SAVAGE, LLP ("SHS") is a foreign limited liability partnership offering professional legal services in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. Defendant SHS's usual place of business in the Commonwealth is at 352 Newberry Street, Boston, Massachusetts.
- 8. At all relevant times, Defendant DAVIS was an attorney at law, licensed to practice law in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and associated with Defendant SHS.
- At all relevant times, Defendant VOLPE was an attorney at law, licensed to practice law in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and associated with Defendant SHS.
- At all relevant times, Defendant DAVIS was acting within the scope of her employment with Defendant SHS.
- At all relevant times, Defendant VOLPE was acting within the scope of his employment with Defendant SHS.
- At all relevant times, Defendant HFC had retained Defendants DAVIS and VOLPE as its attorneys.
- 13. At all relevant times, Defendants were engaged, in part, in the collection of debt for Defendant HFC.
- At all relevant times, Plaintiffs owned the real property at 100 Chestnut Street,
 Hatfield, MA 01038.
- 15. Plaintiffs had a loan with Defendant HFC, Loan No. 522200-835631 (Acct. No. 522200-00-836001-3 on monthly statements), dated March 25, 1998, in

- the original principal amount of \$39,415.12, at a contract rate of 12.997%, secured by a mortgage of Plaintiffs' residence at 100 Chestnut Street, Hatfield (the "Loan").
- Plaintiffs' mortgage securing the Loan by Defendant HFC was recorded in the
 Hampshire County Registry of Deeds, Book 5335 Page 345.
- 17. At the time Plaintiffs originated the Loan, Defendant HFC included in the principal \$39,415.12 borrowed and financed single premiums of \$1,571.09 for credit life insurance and \$863.18 for credit disability insurance, for the benefit of Defendant HFC.
- 18. The entire Loan principal of \$39,415.12 was disbursed on or about March 25, 1998 to pay off two prior HFC accounts (No. 522200-26-765765 and No. 522200-26-765157) in the amounts of \$10,026.74 and \$26,773.11, respectively, and to pay the credit insurance premiums (\$1,571.09 and \$863.18), as well as \$181.00 for title insurance and taxes.
- 19. From March of 1998 through October of 2003, the principal balance due on the Loan as reflected on Defendant HFC's monthly statements to Plaintiffs was a never changing \$39,415.12 (the original principal sum).
- 20. On October 10, 2003, Defendant DAVIS mailed separate but identical debt collection letters on behalf of Defendant HFC to each of the Plaintiffs stating that Plaintiffs could cure a default under their mortgage securing the Loan by paying the outstanding July 2003 through September 2003 monthly payments totaling \$1,307.85 plus \$100 for legal fees and expenses. The letter warns an adjustment might be made after receipt of a payment check and that Plaintiffs would be informed before "depositing the check for collection." The

- letter further advised the Plaintiffs to telephone a specific number and talk with Ms. Colon of Defendant HFC. The letter did not include the debt collection disclosures required by federal law.
- 21. On or about October 20, 2003, Plaintiff Susan Golash telephoned Defendant HFC at the number provided in Defendant DAVIS' October 10, 2003 debt collection letter and told Defendant HFC's Ms. Colon that Plaintiffs were in the process of refinancing their HFC mortgage debt and would like to make a partial payment of the amount necessary to cure the HFC default. Defendant HFC requested further evidence of the Plaintiffs' refinancing.
- 22. On October 23, 2003, Plaintiff Susan Golash again called Defendant HFC to make a telephone payment to cure the default. Plaintiff was advised that instead of the \$1,307.85 plus \$100 for legal fees (for a total of \$1,407.85) due as stated in the October 10, 2003 collection letter, Plaintiffs would have to pay \$2,937.85 to cure the default on the Loan. The \$2,937.85 included the \$1,307.85 in outstanding monthly payments plus \$1,630.00 in additional fees.
- 23. On October 30, 2003, Plaintiff Susan Golash paid \$2,937.85 to Defendant HFC in person at their offices at 935 Riverdale Street, West Springfield, Massachusetts.
- 24. Defendant HFC's November 8, 2003 monthly statement to Plaintiffs,

 Defendant HFC accounted for only \$1,307.85 of the \$2,937.85 payment
 made by Plaintiffs on October 30, 2003.
- 25. Defendant HFC's November 8, 2003 monthly statement to Plaintiffs shows a balance due of \$38,977.51, the first change in the balance due on any monthly statement throughout the entire history of the Loan.

- 26. On November 6, 2003, Defendant HFC provided Plaintiffs' real estate attorney with a Loan payoff letter (good until November 18, 2003) for Plaintiffs' refinancing, which showed \$44,771.21 due in principal and interest, with a per diem interest of \$13.89.
- 27. On November 24, 2003, the Loan was paid off with a payment of \$44,929.55 made to HFC from the proceeds of Plaintiffs' refinancing.
- 28. In a December 3, 2003 letter, Defendant HFC confirmed the Loan was "paid in full" and returned the original Loan Repayment And Security Agreement and the original Mortgage to Plaintiffs.
- 29. On December 3, 2003, HFC executed a Discharge of Mortgage for the satisfaction of the Loan. On December 6, 2003, the Discharge was recorded in the Hampshire County Registry of Deeds, Book 7621 Page 60.
- 30. Defendant HFC's December 8, 2003 monthly statement to Plaintiffs shows the payment of \$44,929.55, \$39,052.56 "applied to balance" and \$5,876.99 applied to "interest, insurance and other charges."
- 31. The \$5,876.99 collected by Defendant HFC as part of the Loan payoff and applied to "interest, insurance and other charges" on the monthly statement has never been itemized, explained or otherwise accounted for by Defendant HFC.
- 32. In a letter dated January 5, 2004, Plaintiffs wrote Defendant SHS requesting an accounting of the \$1,630.00 for additional fees collected from Plaintiffs when they were required to pay \$2,937.85 in October 2003 to cure default of the Loan.

- 33. Defendant HFC and Defendant SHS failed to respond to Plaintiffs' January 5, 2004 letter and failed to account fully for the \$1,630.00 paid by Plaintiffs to Defendant HFC on October 30, 2003.
- 34. On or about December 4, 2003, Defendant VOLPE commenced a foreclosure action, on behalf of Defendant HFC, against Plaintiffs, in the Massachusetts Land Court on the mortgage, which formerly secured the then fully paid Loan.
- 35. On January 6, 2004, the Land Court issued a notice, pursuant to the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, of Defendant HFC's filing of a complaint "for authority to foreclosure [on Plaintiffs'] mortgage in the manner following: by entry and possession and exercise of power of sale" ("Notice").
- 36. On or about January 12, 2004, Defendants delivered the Notice to Plaintiffs' local newspaper, the Daily Hampshire Gazette, for publication to Plaintiffs and the public.
- 37. On and before January 12, 2004, Defendant HFC knew that the Loan had previously been paid and that there were no grounds for the Land Court lawsuit or for publication of the Notice.
- 38. On or before January 13, 2004, Defendant SHS, Defendant DAVIS and Defendant VOLPE knew that the Loan had previously been paid and that there were no grounds for the Land Court lawsuit or for publication of the Notice.
- 39. On January 20, 2004, the false and defamatory Notice was published in the Daily Hampshire Gazette.

COUNT I DEFAMATION

- 40. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate by reference the allegations set forth in Paragraphs 1 through 39 of this Complaint inclusive.
- 41. On or about January 12, 2004, Defendants caused the Notice to be delivered to the Plaintiffs' local newspaper, the Daily Hampshire Gazette for publication.
- 42. The Notice contained false and defamatory statements inferring Plaintiffs' inability or refusal to pay a mortgage debt allegedly owed to Defendant HFC.
- On and before January 13, 2004, Defendants knew that Plaintiffs' Loan with Defendant HFC was fully paid off, that the mortgage formerly securing the Loan was discharged, and that there were no grounds for the Land Court lawsuit or for publication of the Notice.
- Defendants failed to cancel their order for publication of the Notice in the Daily Hampshire Gazette.
- 45. On January 20, 2004, and with Defendants' knowledge or reckless disregard for whether it was false or not, the Notice was published to the public and the Plaintiffs in the Daily Hampshire Gazette.
- 46. The publication of the Notice in the Daily Hampshire Gazette was an unprivileged, unreasonable and unnecessary publication to persons in Plaintiffs' community.
- 47. As a result of the publication of the false and defamatory statements, Plaintiffs have suffered damage to their reputations, personal humiliation, and mental anguish and suffering.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs pray for judgment as set forth herein below.

COUNT II INVASION OF PRIVACY

- 48. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate by reference the allegations set forth in Paragraphs 1 through 47 of this Complaint inclusive.
- 49. The publication of the Notice in The Daily Hampshire Gazette was an invasion of Plaintiffs rights to be let alone, free from unwarranted and defamatory publicity and to be protected from a wrongful intrusion into their life and physical solitude.
- 50. As a result of Defendants invasion of Plaintiffs' privacy, Plaintiffs suffered humiliation and mental anguish and suffering.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs pray for judgment as set forth herein below.

COUNT III INTENTIONAL INFLICTION OF EMOTIONAL DISTRESS

- 51. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate by reference the allegations set forth in Paragraphs 1 through 50 of this Complaint inclusive.
- 52. Defendants' conduct as alleged hereinabove was extreme and outrageous intended by Defendants to cause, or with reckless disregard of the probability of causing, emotional distress to Plaintiffs.
- 53. As a proximate result of Defendants' conduct, Plaintiffs have suffered severe emotional distress.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs pray for judgment as set forth herein below.

COUNT IV VIOLATION OF MASS. GEN. LAWS CHAPTER 93A §§2 and 9

- 54. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate by reference the allegations set forth in Paragraphs 1 through 53 of this Complaint inclusive.
- 55. At all relevant times, Defendants were engaged in trade or commerce.
- 56. Defendant HFC's failure to account for funds collected from Plaintiffs as required by Massachusetts Banking Regulations, 209 C.M.R. 32.07(1), 32.07(3) and 32.07(8), and 209 CMR 32.10, was an unfair or deceptive act or practice unlawful by Chapter 93A and the regulations promulgated thereunder, including 940 C.M.R. 3.16, subsections 1 and 3.
- 57. Defendant DAVIS' use of the October 10, 2004 letter in an attempt to collect a personal debt previously discharged in Plaintiffs' bankruptcy was an unfair or deceptive act or practice unlawful by Chapter 93A and the regulations promulgated thereunder, including 940 C.M.R. 3.16, subsections 1 and 4.
- 58. Defendant DAVIS' use of the October 10, 2004 letter without the debt collection disclosures required by the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, 15 U.S.C. §1692 et seq. was an unfair or deceptive act or practice unlawful by Chapter 93A and the regulations promulgated thereunder, including 940 C.M.R. 3.16, subsections 1 and 4.
- Defendant HFC's collection, with the assistance of Defendants SHS and DAVIS, of an excessive and unreasonable amount of funds from Plaintiffs on October 30, 2004, which was not fully accounted for, was an unfair or deceptive act or practice unlawful by Chapter 93A and the regulations promulgated thereunder, including 940 C.M.R. 3.16, subsections 1 and 3.

- 60. Defendant HFC's collection of an excessive and unreasonable amount of funds from Plaintiffs on November 24, 2004, which was not fully accounted for, was an unfair or deceptive act or practice unlawful by Chapter 93A and the regulations promulgated thereunder, including 940 C.M.R. 3.16, subsections 1 and 3.
- Operation of the Notice in the Daily Hampshire Gazette was an unfair or deceptive attempt to collect an alleged debt in violation of Mass. Gen. Laws c.93 §49(a) because the publication of the Notice was an unauthorized communication to persons other than the Plaintiffs that Plaintiffs were unable or refused to pay an allegedly unpaid mortgage debt to Defendant HFC, and as such was an unfair or deceptive act or practice unlawful by Chapter 93A and the regulations promulgated thereunder, including 940 C.M.R. 3.16, subsections 1 and 3.
- Gazette was an unfair or deceptive attempt to collect an alleged debt in violation of Mass. Gen. Laws c.93 §49(c) because the publication of the Notice was a harassing and embarrassing communication to Plaintiffs and the public that Plaintiffs were unable or refused to pay an allegedly unpaid mortgage debt to Defendant HFC when the debt had been fully paid by Plaintiffs, and as such was an unfair or deceptive act or practice unlawful by Chapter 93A and the regulations promulgated thereunder, including 940 C.M.R. 3.16, subsections 1 and 3.
- 63. Defendants' causing the publication of the Notice in the Daily Hampshire

 Gazette containing false and defamatory statements that Plaintiffs were

unable or refused to pay an allegedly unpaid mortgage debt to Defendant HFC when Defendants knew the debt had been fully paid by Plaintiffs and the mortgage discharged was an unfair or deceptive act or practice unlawful by Chapter 93A and the regulations promulgated thereunder, including 940 C.M.R. 3.16, subsection 1.

- Oefendants' invasion of Plaintiffs' privacy by causing the publication of the Notice in the Daily Hampshire Gazette containing false and defamatory statements that Plaintiffs were unable or refused to pay an allegedly unpaid mortgage debt to Defendant HFC when Defendants knew the debt had been fully paid by Plaintiffs and the mortgage discharged was an unfair or deceptive act or practice unlawful by Chapter 93A and the regulations promulgated thereunder, including 940 C.M.R. 3.16, subsection 1.
- 65. Defendants' intentional infliction on Plaintiffs of emotional distress by causing the publication of the Notice in the Daily Hampshire Gazette containing false and defamatory statements that Plaintiffs were unable or refused to pay an allegedly unpaid mortgage debt to Defendant HFC when Defendants knew the debt had been fully paid by Plaintiffs and the mortgage discharged was an unfair or deceptive act or practice unlawful by Chapter 93A and the regulations promulgated thereunder, including 940 C.M.R. 3.16, subsection 1.
- 66. Defendants' actions complained of herein were performed willfully or knowingly.

67. As a result of Defendants unfair or deceptive acts or practices, Plaintiffs have sustained injuries, including emotional anguish and suffering.

- On May 12, 2004, Plaintiffs, through counsel, sent Defendants written 68. demands for relief by sending Defendants demand letters as required by Chapter 93A §9.
- Defendant HFC has failed to respond to Plaintiffs' demand letter. 69.
- Defendants SHS, DAVIS and VOLPE responded in a letter dated July 7, 2004 70. but refused to make a reasonable offer of relief to Plaintiffs.
- 71. Defendants refusal to grant relief upon demand was in bad faith with knowledge or reason to know that the acts or practice complained of violated Chapter 93A §2.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs pray for judgment as set forth herein below.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

- 1. Judgment for Plaintiffs and against Defendants for damages in an amount according to proof at trial, multiple damages according to Mass. Gen. Laws Chapter 93A §9, interest, costs, and attorneys' fees; and
- For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

REQUEST FOR TRIAL BY JURY

Plaintiffs hereby request a jury trial on all issues triable to a jury.

Plaintiffs STEPHEN GOLASH and SUSAN GOLAS<u>H</u>

Dated: October 6, 2004

/PATRICIA A. SŻUMOWSKI

Attorney for Plaintiffs

GRAHAM & ALBANO, P.C.

100 Russell Street, P.O. Box 377

Hadley, MA 01035 (413) 586-5055

BBO No.: 653839

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

HAMPSHIRE, SS.

SUPERIOR COURT DEPARTMENT OF THE TRIAL COURT C.A. NO: HSCV2004-00232

STEPHEN GOLASH AND SUSAN GOLASH,

Plaintiffs,

VS.

HOUSEHOLD FINANCE CORPORATION II, PATRICIA A. DAVIS, RICHARD J. VOLPE, And SHECHTMAN HALPERIN SAVAGE, LLP Defendants.

To: Civil Clerk, Superior Court Department Hampshire County, Commonwealth of Massachusetts

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that the Defendants, Patricia A. Davis, Richard J. Volpe, and Shechtman Halperin Savage, LLP., have filed in the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts a Notice of Removal of the above-captioned matter. A copy of the Notice of Removal is attached hereto as Exhibit 1.

ACCORDINGLY, please provide the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts with a certified copy of all pleadings and papers filed in this matter, as well as a certified copy of the docket sheets, forthwith.

Respectfully submitted,
Defendants,

Patricia A. Davis, Richard J. Volpe, and Shechtman Halperin Savage, LLP.

By their attorneys

Joseph S. Berman BBO No. 566006

210 Commercial Street, 5th Floor

Boston, MA 02109 617-723-9911

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned does hereby certify that the caused a true and accurate copy of the within Notice of Removal (with attachments) was served via overnight delivery, postage prepaid, upon Patricia A. Szumowski, Graham & Albano, P.C., 100 Russell St., P.O. Box 377, Hadley, MA 01035 and Preston Halperin, Esq., Shechtman, Halperin, & Savage, 86 Weybosset Street, Providence, RI 2903on this the ## day of November 2004.

Soseph S. Berman